

faunistical literature, in manuals for identification of Heteroptera and aquatic fauna, and is often quoted in textbooks on zoogeography as an example of an aquatic insect with a boreo-montane distribution. I could add numerous further references, but it does not seem to be necessary.

It should be noted that the institution holding the neotype of *Corisa propinqua* is the Department of Entomology, National Museum, Prague (there is no 'Prague Museum'). Details of the locality, as confirmed by Dr V. Švihla of the National Museum, should read 'Jezero Plöckensteinské. Dr Štolc'.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Cicada clavicornis* Fabricius, 1794 (currently *Asiraca clavicornis*; Insecta, Homoptera)**  
(Case 3040; see BZN 55: 93–95)

A.F. Emeljanov & I.M. Kerzhner

*Zoological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg 199034, Russia*

We support the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Cicada clavicornis* Fabricius, 1794, the type species of *Asiraca* Latreille, [1796], by the suppression of two senior synonyms, *Cimex aequinoctialis* Scopoli, 1763 and *Cicada quadristriata* Gmelin, 1790. Both *Cicada clavicornis* and *Asiraca* were placed on Official Lists in Opinion 602 (August 1961), so the action proposed will accord with earlier Commission decisions.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the names *Labrus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Cichlasoma* Swainson, 1839 and *Polycentrus* Müller & Troschel, 1849 by the designation of neotypes for *Labrus bimaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *L. punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Osteichthyes, Perciformes)**

(Cases 2880 and 2905; see BZN 50: 215–218 and 53: 106–111; 54: 106–116, 187–189)

(1) Maurice Kottelat

*Route de la Baroche 12, Case Postale 57, 2952 Cornol, Switzerland*

I fully support Dr Sven Kullander's comments and proposals (published in BZN 54: 109–115, June 1997), in contrast to those made by Drs R. Fricke & C.J. Ferraris (BZN 53: 106–111, June 1996). I see Dr Kullander's proposals as the most appropriate way to handle the problems outlined by Fricke & Ferraris and by Kullander (BZN 54: 109–110). Kullander's proposals take into account historical facts and are most suited to maintain stability and universality in the nomenclature. I therefore ask the Commission to accept them.

I am also in favour of retaining *Labrus punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758 in the NANDIDAE, as defined by Kullander's (1983) lectotype. I have read Dr H.-J. Paepke's comments (published in BZN 54: 187–189, September 1997) on *Labrus punctatus* and *Polycentrus schomburgkii* Müller & Troschel, 1849 and do not agree with his proposals (revised from those in Case 2880: BZN 50: 215–218) to give the name *schomburgkii* precedence over *punctatus*. I do not consider the exercise of counting

publications in which a name is used is an intellectually sound argument on which to decide whether a name is worth conserving or not. In the case of names which appear in non-scientific literature, I see even less meaning in this exercise. Do we wish to value more the use of the correct name in a few careful scientific publications, or the use of an incorrect name in a number of non-technical papers in which the authors just list a name because they must? I do not have the time to study the list of 54 uses of the name *schomburgkii* compiled by Paepke. How many are primary scientific literature (that is, they include new, original observations), and how many are mere lists of names (compiled from earlier such lists)?

Kullander's proposal (BZN 54: 110–111) to retain both the names *L. punctatus* and *P. schomburgkii* has the great advantage of not requiring the use of the Commission's plenary powers and of simply following the Code. I do not wish to speculate on whether a nominal species originally described from Surinam (*punctatus*) could turn out to be identical with one described from Guyana (*schomburgkii*); this would be better left to researchers with first hand information on the area. World wide we discover that the total freshwater fish fauna is grossly underestimated and we should therefore refrain from a hasty conclusion. This is even more true of areas which are still very superficially known.

If the Commission were to decide not to follow Kullander's proposals, I believe it should not adopt Paepke's revised proposals. The name *punctatus* should either be available or not; this case is already complicated enough and should not be made more so by a ruling on the 'relative precedence' of names. Few users of zoological information understand the Code.

## (2) Alwyne Wheeler

*Department of Zoology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road,  
London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

It is clear that there are problems with the names of some major fish genera and that Commission action is necessary to deal with them. However, I do not agree with Fricke & Ferraris's intended solution.

Contrary to Fricke & Ferraris's assertion (para. 7 of their application), the name *Labrus mixtus* Linnaeus, 1758 has been, and continues to be, used by the majority of authors for the labrid species and *L. bimaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758 is very much in use for the South American cichlid. Moreover, the cichlid is an aquarium fish and is mentioned, as *Cichlasoma bimaculatum*, in many aquarist publications. To the best of my knowledge the name *Labrus punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758 has never been used since its original publication.

It is clear that in designating *L. bimaculatus* as the type species of *Labrus*, Jordan (1891) misidentified the taxon; he regarded the species called by that name as the female of *L. mixtus* and adopted the name *bimaculatus*. Jordan referred to Günther (1862) and noted: 'We follow Günther ... in regarding the species called *carneus* [Ascanius, 1772] and *bimaculatus* as the female of *Labrus mixtus*. The name *bimaculatus* stands first in the *Systema Naturae*, for which reason we have adopted it, although it is by no means an appropriate one'. In fact Günther (1862, p. 74) used the name *mixtus* for the labrid species and (pp. 276, 277) *bimaculatus* (with references to *Museum Adolphi*, 1, p. 66 and Gronovius, p. 36, no. 87 included among the

synonymies; see paras. 1 and 2 of the application) for the cichlid. Günther also included 'a variety of female, *L. bimaculatus*' in the synonymy of *mixtus*, which undoubtedly confused Jordan.

For the labrid species the authoritative checklist of European marine fishes (Hureau & Monod, 1973) lists 36 usages (1810–1969) of the specific name *mixtus*, but only 15 usages (1788–1973) of *bimaculatus*. In 1992, in providing a list of recommended scientific and common names for British fishes, I noted (p. 21): '*Labrus mixtus*. The cuckoo wrasse [has been] given three binominal names, [attributed to] Linnaeus (1758). Of these, *Labrus bimaculatus* and *L. ossifragus* (amendation for *ossifagus*) have page priority over *L. mixtus* (pp. 285, 286 and 287 respectively). *L. ossifagus* has been used very infrequently; of the other two names *L. mixtus* has been used considerably more than *L. bimaculatus* (vide Bauchot & Quignard, 1973). The first revisor to restrict this multiplicity of names is hard to identify but Cuvier & Valenciennes (1839) synonymized *L. ossifragus* under *L. mixtus*, thus partially restricting its use. Günther (1862) also used *L. mixtus* and regarded *L. bimaculatus* as a synonym. The usage by these critical and authoritative workers of *L. mixtus* in preference to the other names, and the more frequent use of *L. mixtus* in recent literature, make a strong case for recommending the adoption of the name *Labrus mixtus* for continued use'. In the preface to the (1992) publication I also noted: 'Both common and scientific names reflect my own concern to retain widely used and often familiar names for fishes wherever possible. Taxonomists may have little difficulty in juggling with name changes or the reorganization of sequence to reflect current views on phylogeny; fishery workers, ecologists, environmental archaeologists and naturalists frequently find them perplexing and difficult to cope with'.

I therefore approve, and very much endorse, the proposals set out by Kullander (BZN 54: 113–114; June 1997) to designate *L. mixtus* (defined by the neotype designated by Kullander in June 1997; see BZN 54: 113) as the type species of *Labrus* and *L. bimaculatus* as the type species of *Cichlasoma*, thereby maintaining stability in the usages of the names for these genera and species.

#### Additional reference

Hureau, J.C. & Monod, Th. (Eds.). 1973. *Checklist of the fishes of the north-eastern Atlantic and of the Mediterranean*. UNESCO, Paris.

**Comments on the proposed designation of *Iguanodon bernissartensis* Boulenger in Beneden, 1881 as the type species of *Iguanodon* Mantell, 1825, and proposed designation of a lectotype**  
(Case 3037; see BZN 55: 99–104, 172)

(1) Paul M. Barrett

*Department of Earth Sciences, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3EQ, U.K.*

I support Charig & Chapman's proposal (published in June 1998) to designate *Iguanodon bernissartensis* Boulenger in Beneden, 1881 as the type species of *Iguanodon* Mantell, 1825, and I further support the designation of the Belgian skeleton IRSNB 1534 as the lectotype.